



A Conversation With Philip J. Klass

Mutual UFO Network's 26th Annual Symposium, Seattle, July 7 and 8, 1995

by Gayle Nesom

Phil Klass wears an illustrated button that reads, "Expose Yourself to Ufology."

And expose himself he has, for almost three decades. Over the years, he has earned a reputation among ufologists that is not pretty. Most (not all) would agree, however, that it is well deserved. If you've seen him on TV, you know him as the ultimate debunker—smart, single minded, sarcastic, and relentless.

Yet he does have a different side, though I'll probably be crucified for saying so. In the year since I met him—in correspondence, conversations, and this interview—he's been cordial, gracious, and playful. And I thoroughly enjoyed his company. But I would *not* want to be his target.

Phil can legitimately claim to be this world's

head UFO debunker, or "leading skeptical authority," as one book jacket states. A dedicated UFO researcher—though his conclusions seem as predetermined as those he assails—his *stated* agenda is that of countering "extreme

claims," which he does with the persistence of a bulldog.

I did not set out to debate or expose Phil Klass—I'm not crazy. Besides, he's heard all the questions before. This was a conversation with obvious questions and predictable answers. But I came away convinced that "official debunker" or not, he is... probably... *truly* a skeptic.

My very sincere thanks to Phil Klass for granting this interview. Houston Sky



Photo credit: Debbie Stock, Seattle, 1995

spotlights Phil on page 4.

GN: In *SUN*, your *Skeptics UFO Newsletter*, your focus this year has been Roswell. Why are you so interested if the case has no merit?

PK: In my newsletter, I try to focus on things I think are new and newsworthy. If, for example, Betty Hill were to announce that she had been abducted last week, this would attract considerable interest by the UFO community, and I would report it. There was such great interest—new books coming out on the alleged UFO crash at Roswell, the GAO investigation. So it's a subject I'll continue to follow. The July issue of *SUN* reported a *new* alleged impact site, not 30 miles north of Roswell—or 35—but actually 50 miles west, according to Jim Ragsdale. To my knowledge, *SUN* was the first to report this *and* the first to report that

Dr. John Mack was under investigation by a Harvard committee. *SUN* reported it a month before the Boston newspapers, two months before the *New York Times*.

GN: Who are your sources? Why were you first?

PK: Because I have so many pro-UFO friends who question, challenge, disbelieve, who are becoming increasingly skeptical about certain aspects. They have not become converts to full skepticism... The item about the new disk crash site, for example, came from a source who is a very famous name in ufology.

GN: Can you divulge any names?

See Klass, page 3

Worth Repeating

A Digest of Ideas from Researchers, Enthusiasts, Buffs, Kooks, Skeptics, Debunkers, and Others

Methods Questioned, Academic Freedom Reaffirmed

"Harvard Law School professor Alan Dershowitz, who is critical of [Dr. John] Mack's methods but defends his right to choose his research topics, said that while he applauded the outcome [of the three-member panel review], the investigation had been a mistake.

'In the end, having to hire a law firm to defend your research will chill controversy,' Dershowitz said." —*Washington Post*, August 4, 1995

See WR, page 2

This Issue

Phil Klass Interview
NASA Photos Correction
Roswell GAO Report
UFO Notebook
Spotlight
Worth Repeating
Deep Throat
UFO LINGO
MUFON-Houston
More!

Enclosures

MUFON-Houston Marfa
Trip Information
Subscription Form

Worth Repeating

For the Record

"...Len Stringfield did not share the names of his crash/retrieval sources with me. For some time before his death, however, he was assisting Roswell witness Glenn Dennis and me in our efforts to develop leads to independent sources who might be able to back up Glenn's story and perhaps help us solve the mystery of the missing nurse.

"Len and Glenn got to know each other via telephone after Glenn contacted Len at the urging of Rick Biskynis (MUFON-Houston) and myself. After vetting Glenn six ways from Sunday, Len concluded he was truthful. Moreover, he was amazed that Glenn's recollections of the nurse's description of the bodies she said she helped examine in the Roswell Army Air Field infirmary were consistent with information Len had from other sources, including important elements he had not made public. Len warned Glenn he was now on the hot seat and told him he could count on his help.

"The day after Len died, a member of his family called Glenn Dennis, following Len's instructions. Len wanted Glenn to be informed of his death and to know that he'd told his family they were to continue to help Glenn in any way possible. Glenn advised me of this soon after...." —Karl Pflock, in a letter to MUFON's State Director for Ohio, Bill Jones, in the *Ohio UFO Notebook* #10 (MidOhio Research Associates, Box 162, 5837 Karric Square Dr., Dublin, OH 43817; \$20/year)

See WR, page 3

The NASA Moon Photos: A Correction

by Vito Saccheri

On July 11, I received a call from Gayle Nesom, editor of *Houston Sky*, telling me that Marvin Czarnik up in St. Louis felt I had misquoted him in the recent article I wrote regarding the NASA moon pictures (June/July 1995 issue, Vol. 5). I immediately called Marvin, and we confirmed that I had in fact misquoted him (for which, I, of course, apologize) and that he also had misunderstood some of the statements I had made during our short meeting in April.

Marvin and I met for the first and only time during his trip to Houston in April '95, when he came to lecture on the moon pictures at a meeting sponsored by VISIT, a local UFO group in Clear Lake City near Houston.

In the article, I stated that Marvin had told me the "alpha" and "bravo" voice communication links I had found in the transcripts referred to switching stations whereby astronaut transmissions were redirected away from mission control in Houston to CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia. (This "redirection" was the missing piece of the puzzle I'd been looking for since '79.)

Marvin reminded me, however, that what he had really said was that the redirections, as he understood it, were to missile bases in the northwest portion of the country, as they were equipped with "secured communications equipment" and that consequently, he had never mentioned Langley at all.

By the same token, he had misunderstood some of my statements and had left the April meeting believing NASA had sent Lester and me

to Langley, Virginia, to see the moon pictures. (In reality, we had sent forms to Langley to obtain the correct photo ID numbers for the southwest region.)

In all fairness to Marvin, I offer my apologies and advise that the article has been revised accordingly. In all fairness to both of us, however, we had only a few minutes to chat and swap information during the short break of his VISIT lecture (before the intermission). And we were frequently interrupted by people from the audience asking him questions. As a result, our conversation was short, fragmented, and lacking in continuity. While his mind had moved on to a new topic, mine was still in the Langley mode (and in my mind, the very word "Langley" is synonymous and interchangeable with "CIA").

Also, please be advised that the confusion between us was compounded somewhat further because when issued, the article itself was only a condensed version of the original. Due to space limitations, *Houston Sky* was forced to edit out various portions. This is not at all their fault since the newsletter is a relatively new publication and it is not yet economically feasible for them to add pages or publish more frequently. I am certain, however, that they will make the full and "corrected" version available to all interested parties for the nominal cost of photocopying and postage.

I hope this correction sets the record straight. Once again, my apologies to Marvin and his troops in St. Louis.

Editor's note: Vito's NASA story has generated a lot of discussion, mostly positive, quite a bit of which has tended to support various points. In Houston, a small research group has formed and, with Vito's encouragement and help, is pursuing several aspects of the story to identify corroborating evidence and also to uncover inaccuracies. We'll be reporting on developments in future issues of Houston Sky. We thank Vito for submitting this correction to Houston Sky (and to the internet). To order a copy of the longer version of Vito's story, please send an SASE and a check for \$2 to Houston Sky, PO Box 1718, Bellaire, Texas 77402. ♦

Subscriptions & Contributions

Houston Sky is mailed six times a year. **Beginning with the next issue, Oct./Nov. 1995, *Houston Sky* will be available by subscription only.** Send a check for \$15 (\$20 foreign) payable to Houston Sky, PO Box 1718, Bellaire, TX 77402.

Subscriber: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone (optional): _____ Date: _____

Klass, from page 1

PK: When I can I do, but if asked not to, then I don't.

GN: In your opinion, is the Santilli autopsy film a recent hoax, an early hoax, or something else?

PK: I suspect it's a recent hoax. By recent, I understand that Santilli had the film for a year and a half or two years—that's what I mean by recent.

GN: The Roswell Declaration is a request for the release of any information on what the government knows about the existence of extraterrestrial life, not an endorsement of any belief. If, as you say, there are no ETs and no cover-up, the release of government documents could only bolster your position. Have you signed a copy, and if not, would you?

PK: I contemplated signing it, but I did not like the wording of it. I think that Captain Kent Jeffrey works for a certain airline that I consider a very fine, safe airline, and I consider their pilots competent. But supposing I would form a "Phil Klass-XYZ Airlines Declaration" in which I asked the airline and all its pilots to release information on all mistakes ever made by XYZ pilots and XYZ maintenance. Would Kent Jeffrey sign it? I doubt it because the implication is one of cover-up. So, as I say, if I had signed it, I would have added the postscript that he prepare a similar document for signature in which all UFO believers would agree to accept the word of the President or the Congress that all [UFO-related] information has been released and that they would never again falsely accuse the government of cover-up. I would like to see how many ufologists would sign that.

GN: But signing the Declaration does not mean you believe the government *didn't* release all information.

PK: The way it is worded, it implies guilt rather than innocence. And I am a great believer in the idea that one should assume a person is innocent until proven guilty.

GN: But you can't argue that the government has covered up. What about the information released through the Freedom of Information Act?

PK: There's been a cover-up to some extent. Let me give you an example. Supposing that our ambassador in France was interviewing Charles de Gaulle, and de Gaulle said, "I not only believe in flying saucers, I believe I was abducted during World War II—but please, this is just between us." And supposing the ambassador wrote a memo and sent it to the

State Department. It might well be classified simply to avoid embarrassing General de Gaulle.

The blacked-out NSA documents that Stan Freedman loves to hold up mention UFOs in a peripheral sense. The reason they are being withheld is that they would reveal how and where we intercepted Soviet or Cuban or Chinese messages, how we've been able to decode them, which codes we've been able to decode, which we have not, and so on.

GN: But those are the documents you *have* seen... What about the ones not released?

PK: No, these are the documents that have *not* been released.

GN: How do you know?

PK: Because I know what NSA does. NSA eavesdrops on Communists and potentially unfriendly communications, and decodes—tries to decode them. So if any of those [blacked-out] documents reveal that the Soviets or Cubans know we have extraterrestrial visitors, how could the U.S. government hope to maintain its secrecy without having Fidel Castro call an international news conference and say, "I'm going to reveal the biggest secret of the last 2000 years"? Because all of those NSA documents are communications intelligence that we have intercepted and decoded from Communist-bloc countries. So, for any UFO secrets that are there, they are known and *were* known to our then worst enemies who love to frustrate and embarrass the U.S. government.

GN: Do you think the government has no interest in UFO reports and radar sightings?

PK: How would you like to find out for certain? Here is a test that will take 15 or 20 minutes and reveal to you whether the government is secretly interested or not. Let's assume there's a street in Houston called Main Street. At 10th and Main, there's a filling station with public telephones. Some night—I'm not going to tell you what night because you might think I have a prearrangement—you go to that station at about 10 or 11 in the evening after it has closed down, and you call CIA headquarters, FBI headquarters, the Pentagon, a nearby air base, a local FBI office—I'll let you select it. You call this office, and you say, "My name is Mary Smith" (use a pseudonym), "and I'm at 10th and Main, and a flying saucer has just landed, and three strange creatures have gotten out, and I happen to have my Sony video camera with me, and I got 10 minutes of videotape showing all this." If the government is secretly interested, the voice on the other end will say, "Miss Smith, don't go near it, stand back, and in 10 minutes we will have a SWAT team there. And in 10 minutes,

See Klass, page 4

Worth Repeating

Provincialism at Its Best

Washington Post headline:

"Harvard Clears UFO

Author: Case Raised Concern on Academic Freedom," 8/4/95

Houston Chronicle headline: "Alien-Sex Professor Gets Reprieve: Harvard Decides Not to Censure Him for UFO Research," 8/4/95

Cost of False Memories

Louisiana MUFON State Director Barney Garner writes, "The following [excerpt of an] AP story is another warning to those who want to use hypnotic regression to investigate possible abductions by aliens or other mysterious phenomenon: 'St. Paul, MN, 8/1/95... Vynnette Hamanne believed she was the victim of bizarre childhood sexual abuse involving satanic rituals... None of it was true, and a jury has ordered the woman's psychiatrist to pay her \$2.5 million for planting false memories in her mind... Monday's verdict against Dr. Diane Humenansky is the largest ever handed down against a doctor accused of implanting false memories, attorneys said..."

"I think the effect is a stunning warning to therapists...and to insurance companies in that they had better start obeying the informed consent laws and stop using experimental treatments like recovered memory treatments on patients without their permission," attorney R. C. Barden said. "This is a huge warning shot to them." — *Louisiana MUFON* Jul.-Aug. 1995 newsletter, 752 Daventry Dr., Baton Rouge, LA 70808 (\$15/yr)

See WR, page 4

Worth Repeating

Astronaut Gordon Cooper on Record After 14 Years

"I did have occasion in 1951 to have two days of observation of many flights of them, of different sizes, flying in fighter formation...over Europe... The weatherman in our base...in Germany...saw these, looked like aircraft, very high altitude, flying over in formation very much like we fly in fighter outfits... and pretty soon several other people on the base had binoculars and were looking at them.

"But we could never even get airborne in our airplanes; we could never get close to them. They were well above where we were, but they were very metallic looking and double lenticular shape, flying in formations...and we never could determine what they really were or were not." —Mercury Seven astronaut Gordon Cooper, in a Dec. 14, 1993, videotaped interview with Michael Hesemann for German TV, reported in "UFO Chronicle," by Antonio Huneus, *Fate* magazine, and shown by Antonio in "The Lone Star Bar" at the 1995 Ozarks UFO Conference in Eureka Springs, Arkansas

Get Your Free Copy!

A copy of the GAO's report *Government Records: Results of a Search for Records Concerning the 1947 Crash Near Roswell, New Mexico* (document # GAO/NSIAD-95-187), can be obtained free by phone (202/512-6000), fax (202/258-4066), or mail: U.S.

General Accounting Office, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884." —New Mexico Congressman Steven Schiff's July 28, 1995, news release

See *WR*, page 8

Spotlight on Philip J. Klass

Philip J. Klass was born in Des Moines, Iowa, and raised in Cedar Rapids. He graduated from Iowa State University in electrical engineering and worked 10 years in avionics for General Electric. In 1973, he was named a Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and in 1988, he was honored by Iowa State with a Professional Achievement Citation in Engineering. Phil is listed in "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who in the World," "Who's Who in Engineering," and "Who's Who in Aviation and Aerospace."

Combining his engineering and writing skills, he has, since 1952—for 43 years—written for *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, for which he is still a contributing avionics editor. Once a year, he is responsible for a special report in *Aviation Week* on electronic warfare, and as *Houston Sky* went to press, Phil was completing his 1995 report. Last year's addressed whether the Pentagon would develop a common Missile Approach Warning System to protect against infrared-guided missiles for the many types of U.S. Air Force, Navy, and Army aircraft. In

1971, Phil published the first book on "spy satellites," *Secret Sentinels in Space*, which covered both Soviet and U.S. satellites.

Phil promotes his UFO views in print as well as on TV and radio. He has published *Skeptics UFO Newsletter* bimonthly for five and a half years. *SUN* has approximately 400 readers, including subscribers, exchanges, and complimentary copies. Eight pages on canary yellow, it provides a look at what Phil Klass finds intriguing and newsworthy. It's articulate, witty, and surprisingly polite (\$15/year; \$20 overseas airmail; 404 "N" St. SW, Wash., D.C. 20024).

His other UFO publications include *UFOs: Identified*, 1968; *UFOs: Explained*, 1975; *UFOs: The Public Deceived*, 1983; *UFO Abductions: A Dangerous Game*, 1989. Phil's work can also be found in *Skeptical Inquirer*, the official publication of CSICOP (the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal), for which he was a founding member and is currently an executive council member and UFO subcommittee chairman. ♦

Klass, from page 3

you'll see two or three helicopters descending, and they'll say, "Where is the UFO?" You'll say, "It flew off." "Well, where is your video cam?" And you'll say, "They took it with them."

But if I'm right, the voice on the other end will say, "Thank you very much for calling. We suggest you report it to your local law enforcement agency." Or maybe if it's a local air base, they would say, "We happen to know the name of the local MUFON chapter—here is the phone number. Thank you very much for calling. Have a very pleasant evening."

Now I would give you 10-to-1 odds that you get the second response. But if the government is secretly interested and if you are telling the truth, which you could be if you have 10 or 15 minutes of video, it could be on CNN within the hour—the secret of the millennia would be out. There could no longer be any doubt.

So when you get back to Houston, I urge you to run this test.

GN: I will keep that under advisement. Probably I won't do it...

PK: Yes, because you don't want the risk.

GN: Didn't you say there's a \$10,000 fine for false reports?

PK: No. If you report to the FBI that you've been abducted, and they investigate and find out you're lying... The laws do not say that it is a

serious crime if you are abducted by a *human being* but that it is quite okay if you are abducted by an *alien*. The laws say *abduction* is a very serious thing in this country. It is a federal offense. But I cannot get anyone to run this simple experiment.

GN: Nobody wants to get into trouble with the FBI.

PK: There is no federal or state law that makes it illegal to falsely report a UFO sighting or UFO encounter. I wish there were.

GN: Are there any UFO cases you'd concede have some merit?

PK: Well, one needs to rephrase the question: Are there any cases I have encountered, investigated, heard about in the last 29 years, that would lead me to believe that we might have extraterrestrial visitors? The answer is no. If and when I learn of such a case, I will rush to investigate it, hoping that I can sit down at my word processor and write the most exciting story I have written in 43 years at *Aviation Week & Space Technology*. I would expect to win the Pulitzer Prize and a giant bonus. The story would say, "I have at last found and investigated a case for which I can find no prosaic, no earthly explanation. I therefore

See *Klass*, page 5

Klass, from page 4

think we might have extraterrestrial visitors."

Let me tell you, at my age—75—the happiest event I can imagine (if I prayed, I'd pray for this to happen) would be for an honest-to-goodness extraterrestrial craft to land in my front yard, on the White House lawn, on the Pentagon Mall, and for it to be filmed and shown on CNN. I would have to pay Stan Freedman \$10,000, I'd have to refund all the subscriptions to *SUN*, and I'd have to issue a statement that I was wrong. However, this would give me 30 or 40 hours a week of spare time, which I don't have now. At my age, this would be the happiest moment of my life.

GN: Why do you push yourself, then?

PK: I can't escape it. Let me give you an example. I took retirement July 1, 1986. I was going to freelance write, but an *Aviation Week* publisher wanted me to sign on as a contributing editor, and one of my first assignments was to put out a special report in early February on electronic warfare. This was a new working relationship, and I wanted it to succeed. So I started work on this special issue in mid-November because the copy was due in late January. I worked Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, New Year's Eve, New Year's Day. And the first week of January 1987, my wife and I are watching television, and here comes a report: "Japan Airlines pilot reports he was chased by a UFO over Alaska." And I don't very often use this language, but I turned to my wife and said, "Oh, shit." This means my phone will start ringing—"Okay Phil, what's your explanation?" I can honestly say I'm just too busy to investigate it. But the [public] would say, "Ah-ha, this is the case Phil Klass can't explain!" So this is what I mean—if I were to announce that I was getting out of the UFO business, people would say, "Phil has finally discovered a case he can't solve."

GN: One of the points you make about abductees—alleged abductees—is that they like the notoriety. Maybe *you* like the notoriety of being the number-one skeptic.

PK: A good point. First, I get great notoriety from my writings in *Aviation Week*. I wrote the first book ever published on American and Russian "spy satellites," published 24 years ago. About a month ago, the CIA finally unveiled Corona—a code name for an early spy satellite—and had a two-day conference. I attended, of course, and later wrote a story. Three people came up to me, seeing my name-tag, saying, "Mr. Klass, I first read your book 24 years ago." Later, I got a call from a former CIA official who had been involved in the pro-

gram, complimenting me on an excellent story. I don't need this [UFO] exposure. As a matter of fact, truthfully, a little over a month ago, I got a call from Larry King. Would I appear on the show Friday night with Whitley Strieber? They would send me over a copy of his new book. Friday morning, they called to say they'd decided to focus instead on the F-16 pilot shot down over Bosnia. I said, "Thank god, that's the best news I've heard." The producer was shocked: "What do you mean? Are you happy *not* to appear on the 'Larry King Live' show?" And I said, "You'll never know—with my busy schedule, I'm delighted. Now I won't have to finish reading Strieber's book this afternoon."

GN: Last year, several of us asked you who would succeed you when you retired? Are you ready to hand off your title of chief debunker?

PK: I would love it. CSICOP's Paul Kurtz keeps saying, "Phil, we've got to find a successor for you." I agree, and I keep looking, but I can't find anybody willing to put in the time, take the verbal abuse, and so on.

GN: You enjoy it somehow, or you'd just say to hell with it.

PK: Well, I enjoy coming to these conferences, and if I had [time], if I were not on the board of directors of our condominium, for which I am spending 20 to 30 hours a week... UFOs are my *third* priority. I also do consulting work. But I would love to find a successor. Now, when an issue comes up on Russian-Soviet UFOs, I turn that over to Jim Oberg because that's his specialty. Whenever I can, I love to hand things off to others.

GN: Let's say for the sake of conversation that UFOs are nuts-and-bolts craft from another part of our universe. If you had to imagine a likely propulsion system, what would you propose?

PK: I would prefer for you to ask me the following question: If it is true that 10,000 angels can dance on the head of a pin, what kind of shoes do they wear to keep from falling off?

GN: You won't speculate?

PK: But [mine] is a much older question. If we could figure out what kind of shoes they wear to keep from falling off, think what a valuable contribution to society that would be... You're smiling, why? Let me give you another one. If God is a woman, does she wear a brassiere?

GN: Your point is it's an irrelevant question?

See Klass, page 6

Deep-Throat

Unsubstantiated-but-Persistent Rumors From the UFO Grapevine

Rumors are rampant over the Santilli autopsy film— Was Truman present? How many bodies/autopsies were there? Does the film depict *alien* autopsies or some form of *human* mutilation? What about polydactylism? Could the strange appearance of the body(ies) be the result of Turner's syndrome? Now a U.S. Air Force archivist claims to have found evidence that the government or government contractor actually created anthropomorphic dummies in the mid-1940s and that these dummies could explain the "bodies" reportedly seen at Roswell. The Air Force is even rumored to be working on another report that will present the anthropomorphic "dummy" story. **DT** asks, "What do they take us for... *dummies*?"

The Mid Ohio Research Associates reporting that they may have uncovered **evidence of the existence of Blue Book Report #13.** Speculation has circulated for years. It'll be interesting to see what they turn up.

Congressman Steven Schiff apparently asked the GAO to look into **MJ 12** matters as well as Roswell. The conclusion concerning a particular document questioned was, not surprisingly, "forgery." *What else is Schiff having investigated?*

The Bigelow Foundation has withdrawn its funding from the MUFON-CUFOS-FUFOR Coalition. **DT** wonders who the next lucky recipient is...

Heard any rumors? Pass them on via snail- or e-mail to houstonky@AOL.com. ♦

HOUSTON SKY No. 6 Aug./Sept. '95 **5**

UFO Notebook

by Bill Eatwell

In this issue, I will finish reviewing "A Scientific Analysis of Unconventional Flying Objects," by the late Paul R. Hill. His unpublished document, still in draft form, was made available in 1993 by his daughter, Julie M. Hill. I purchased my copy from the Center for UFO Studies at last year's MUFON convention in Austin. I did not see it this year in Seattle. Contact CUFOS if you are interested in a copy.

In *Houston Sky*'s issues 3, 4, and 5, I summarized Hill's UFO propulsion theories and his analysis of other propulsion means and concepts. It is Paul Hill's hypothesis that a force field emission of some type is the means for UFO flight. To support his theories, he used mathematics, physics, scientific theories, and several documented multiple witness sightings.

As I noted in the last issue, Hill theorized that the UFO's ability to focus its force field allows it to maneuver in any direction. However, when it is close to the ground, the force field leaves various impressions, or ground trace effects. Hill wrote that these trace effects, or "saucer rings," were from UFO radiation of ionizing strength that chemically altered and dried the earth simultaneously into a crystalline-powder form. This resulted in soil that would not absorb moisture. Hill also theorized that those saucer rings that remained phosphorescent for several days did so because the chemical action of "light quanta generated by electrons dropping to lower energy levels is a slow process."

See Notebook, page 7

Klass, from page 5

PK: No, that it's a purely speculative question.

GN: You never speculate?

PK: I have no competence in propulsion, and I leave it to others.

GN: But you do have competence in advanced aeronautics technology?

PK: Yes.

GN: To your knowledge, then, is the Aurora, which I understand has just been declassified—

PK: That rumor's been circulating, but if it's so, the networks don't think it important enough to carry it.

GN: Is it the most advanced aircraft?

PK: In my opinion, there is no aircraft designated the "Aurora."

GN: But a group of planes, or the technology?

PK: To my knowledge? First, we know we have spy satellites, but they have certain intrinsic limitations. For example, if a Russian spy satellite was passing over Seattle tonight, and suddenly there was something over in Oakland that was of interest, you cannot suddenly say, "Satellite, turn left or turn right." Aircraft, or piloted vehicles—aircraft that operate in the atmosphere—are much more flexible. They have certain disadvantages, but they have the advantage of flexibility. You can fly over Seattle and take a photograph, and then fly to Butte, Montana, and take a photograph. You know that the SR-71 has that capability.

We also know that several years ago, as an economy move, the defense department decided to put the model in mothballs. It was 30 years old, had been out of production for 25 to 30 years. And when they needed a spare part, it was fantastically expensive to make one. Now, last I heard, there's a move to take two or three of them out of mothballs because we need that capability over Bosnia and Iraq. If we had an Aurora airplane, we would not go to that great expense and trouble of de-mothballing.

GN: What, then, is the most advanced experimental aircraft? There was something just released about a round, UFO-type craft, the Dark Star.

PK: No, actually, it's not round, it's more like a flying wing. This is called a Tier-3 Minus, and it's an unmanned aerial vehicle developed by a team of Lockheed, "Skunkworks," and Boeing for possible use as a reconnaissance platform. It's in competition with another vehicle called a Tier-2 Plus, which is not as stealthy but which can fly higher at a safer altitude. And the Pen-

tagon, the last I heard, will be testing both types and might fly some of one or both—they haven't decided yet. But I don't keep up—my specialty is not airplanes.

I can imagine that there might be one or two secret experimental aircraft. I would be surprised if there were not. But I cannot imagine an Aurora airplane that is supposedly deep secret and is being sighted over West Oshkosh, Wisconsin, for example.

GN: What do you think happened in the Cash Landrum incident?

PK: Well, shortly after it happened, I wrote John Schuessler to ask him when we could see a statement from the ladies' doctors about their medical conditions *before* the incident. His response was, "Read my next MUFON paper." When the next MUFON paper came out, there was nothing about their previous health conditions. So I wrote him again, and then he replied that they considered that very personal and an invasion of privacy. I said, wait a minute... If their health was excellent before and they are willing to discuss their ill health now... If it had been the reverse and you said, well, here is a report on their health condition before, which shows they were in perfect health for their age, but it's an invasion of privacy to ask about their health now—that I could understand. So until such time as John Schuessler and the people involved agree to release the medical records of their condition before the incident, I just can't waste time with it. That's my position.

GN: But that's skirting the issue.

PK: Supposing I was to charge that after this interview with you I came down with AIDS, or excess cholesterol, and sued you. Would your lawyer ask to see my medical records before our meeting to find out if I had high cholesterol or AIDS previously? Wouldn't that be rational?

GN: I still think you are skirting the issue because you *can* discuss aspects of the case without knowing *all* about these women. And they weren't the only ones who saw the object. There were other reports...

PK: I even saw the UFO from Washington, D.C. I was out that night, and I could see it way down in Texas.

GN: Okay, next question.

PK: No, that is a fundamental. If their health condition was excellent, then there is absolutely no reason I can see *not* to release the records. But, number two: 15 years have gone

See Klass, page 7

Klass, from page 6

by. If these ladies were irradiated, I would presume they died of leukemia long ago. Are they still alive?

GN: They are, but neither one has worked since. And Betty Cash has had breast and skin cancer.

PK: Betty Cash had complained about hair falling out. If she had taken chemotherapy before the incident, that could well be explained.

GN: What you're saying is that she may have had chemotherapy a month or week before the incident—or six months before? One of the problems I have is that you try to undermine witnesses without addressing other aspects of the case.

PK: Let me ask a personal question. Have you ever told a lie in your entire life?

GN: Sure.

PK: Do you know anyone who could honestly say they have never told a lie?

GN: Probably not.

PK: So how can you explain that Richard Nixon did not know anything about the Watergate break-in and the Republican involvement until a year afterward? At least, that's what he first said. Now, if you had asked me to explain how the President could not know—well, it turned out he was not telling the truth. So, anyone who believes that human beings never—almost never—tell falsehoods... But let's come back to the 22 helicopters. Under those circumstances, if the story of the incident happened as they described, I would very much doubt that anyone would take the time to count the number of helicopters. Number two, and I am a bit foggy on details—it has been 15 years—but in one of their early appearances, Betty Cash or Vickie Landrum reported seeing Jesus Christ.

GN: Betty Cash was a fundamentalist Christian. That was her only explanation of what it could have been.

PK: Was that what she said she saw, or not?

GN: That's the way she perceived it, and that's what she reported.

PK: So maybe Jesus was flying a flying saucer. Are you going to start saying, "Well, we've got to interpret, we've got to change what they said? Also, if these people were irradiated from 10,000 yards, then the crew of the helicopters must have died of radiation long ago. They were much closer. And if 22 helicopters, each with a pilot and co-pilot—to say nothing of other crew—if four people from

a helicopter squadron all died, surely we'd have heard of it.

I don't dismiss the possibility that there is intelligent life elsewhere and that they may have nuclear bombs. But if this is true and the government knows, then as of 1980, I would have expected an all-out government effort to develop defenses against UFOs, especially in the form of some high-energy lasers. But I know from having followed such programs that there was no such effort. I can only assume that if this was an extraterrestrial nuclear weapon and if the government knew, then we have many, many derelict officials of that government and every government.

GN: Who, in your opinion, are the most credible UFO researchers today?

PK: I would commend the work of Dan Wright in this matter of analyzing the abductee transcripts. I think Karl Pflock has done some good work, but I would fault him in certain other areas. Tom Deuley is a chap I have considerable admiration for—a reasonable, rational guy. And there are probably others whose names don't come to me now.

GN: Why Tom Deuley?

PK: He gave a paper at the 1987 MUFON conference which was entitled—and I'm going on memory—something like "NSA UFO Papers." He reported that when he was in the navy and assigned to the NSA (National Security Agency), he told them, "I'm interested in UFOs. It's my hobby." You know, you make a clean breast of everything. In his paper, he said that during the next several years, nobody at NSA came to him and said, "We've got a UFO problem," or "We've got this on UFOs," until the Freedom of Information Act was filed, which Stan Freedman loves to talk about, asking for all NSA papers on UFOs. And the NSA—again I'm going on memory—released several documents that had been written by NSA employees, privately, you know—"If UFO really exist, then could we eavesdrop on their communications"—that sort of thing. And there were about 135 communications, intelligence documents that were not released.

Tom Deuley, in his paper, said that because of his UFO interest and familiarity with the need to keep communications intelligence techniques secret, he was asked to go through those papers to see if they could be released or if they would reveal that we had a bug in Gorbachev's limousine or in the bed of his mistress, or that we had managed to decode

See Klass, page 8

Notebook, from page 6

According to Hill, chemical analysis of the soil in ground trace rings associated with UFO activity indicated that a "dual-wave" mechanism was at work.

Hill theorized "that the propulsive waves and the ionizing waves are two separate entities that (more or less) go out together." The propulsive, or "hard waves," are waves of x-ray strength and "could provide some form of supporting wave mechanics for the generation of force-field waves, or [could] simply be a byproduct of the force-field generation." According to Hill, the often reported column of light between a UFO and the ground is not an electromagnetic beam, such as a spotlight, but a column of ionized air activated by x-ray photons accompanying the focused force field. Recorded UFO damage to turf gives supporting evidence to Hill's theory that the propulsive force field can be focused into a narrow ring-shaped beam. Physically, in earth's gravity, propulsion thrust must be greater than weight for hovering or acceleration by any flight vehicle. In my opinion, the compressed turf in a ring could supply data regarding the UFO's weight. By measuring the compressed soil's ability to support "X" amount of weight in pounds per square inch (psi), the area of the ring (inches squared) times the psi of the supporting soil should equal roughly how heavy the UFO was in pounds. If one calculates the physical volume of several witnessed UFOs from the estimated dimensions observed, a correlation of

See Notebook, page 8

Worth Repeating

Is Anyone Listening?

"The following item appeared in a USG Foreign Broadcast Information Service report on the contents of Moscow Russian Public Television, June 12, 1995, 'Novosti' newscast presented by Igor Vykhukholev: 'Ukrainian radio astronomers in Kharkov believe they may have received signals from a giant artificial structure in space, perhaps a colony established by other life forms. Video shows Kharkov antenna [and] interview with astronomer.'" —6/17/95 internet posting from James Oberg

See *WR*, page 9

Notebook, from page 7

size, weight, and bearing load on the soil could yield some scientific data regarding a UFO's material composition.

Paul Hill's document is a treasure chest of UFO propulsion engineering theories, supported by extensive mathematics and selected eyewitness accounts. However, there are other published and well-engineered theories that need reviewing in this column. It is time we moved on.

In the next issue of *Houston Sky*, I will present the UFO-inspired advanced propulsion theories of Houston research physicist Alan C. Holt, whose work has been published in numerous magazines and scientific journals.

Comments regarding my column or UFO propulsion can be sent via e-mail to Beatwell@aol.com. On the internet, I can be reached at carwell@rosharon.wireline.slb.com ♦

Klass, from page 7

one of their top-secret codes, and so on. And again I'm paraphrasing from memory, but Deuley's statement was, "I think I held in my hand or examined essentially all of those documents and agreed they should *not* be released and that there was nothing of great significance.

I admire his candor, and in fact today (in Seattle), I was telling him that the CIA had released or was in the process of releasing about 800,000 or 900,000 spy satellite photos taken from 1960 to 1972 and that maybe MUFON ought to fund an analysis of those photos. Not of *every* one, but you know, you pick at random and analyze them to find out if there were any UFOs. He realized when we were discussing it that maybe you could analyze—in effect, program a computer—to scan each picture and look for something that's circular which would include UFOs—it might also include football stadiums.... But at least that would be a start. And he was quite interested in this and was thinking of exploring it.

GN: Would you categorize yourself as a skeptic or a debunker? How would you define the two?

PK: I don't know the difference. I would define myself as intrinsically a skeptic about extreme claims. If you claimed you had never told a falsehood in your life, if you were a securities salesman and said you had a stock that was going to double in price... One cannot debunk unless there is bunk there to debunk, and so where I think there are wild, unjustified claims being made, then I guess I would plead guilty to being a debunker. If somebody is promoting or making bunko claims, then I would be a debunker.

GN: Why do you think there are so many very intelligent people interested in UFOs?

PK: Here you are asking me to evaluate people's motives, and that is a very difficult thing to do. All I can say is that the vast majority of astronomers, of physicists, of members of the National Academy of Science in this country and, I think, in most countries, are not impressed with the UFO evidence. Why are they not impressed? Well, you'd have to ask them. I think they're not impressed for the same reason I'm not impressed.

GN: Carl Sagan, another skeptic, concedes that there could be thousands of planets with life out there and that they could be billions of years older than our civilization—but that ETs can't be *here*.

PK: I'm not sure that I've head him make the argument that they *cannot* be here—he has failed to find evidence.

GN: But it would seem to follow that the technology of any advanced civilization would be far beyond our understanding of the laws of science. Can you accept that, at least hypothetically?

PK: I guess that is certainly possible. Arthur Clarke has made the statement that advanced technology would seem like black magic. But the fundamental problem is that there are no credible scientific artifacts. Broken bushes—and *only* extraterrestrial craft can break bushes, *only* extraterrestrial craft can make excavations in the dirt.... If there is one characteristic that is universal about human beings, it is that they bring back souvenirs. In 1961, for example, if Betty and Barney Hill had brought back a quartz watch, we would have looked at it and said, "This thing could not possibly have been made on this earth."

And if any intelligent creatures ever land on the surface of the moon, they'll know that intelligent creatures were there before them. They'll find garbage, they'll find a Swedish Hasselblad camera that one of our astronauts left behind. But more important, they'll find scientific instruments left there to measure seismic activity and to transmit the information back—because explorers are eager to investigate, learn, expand their knowledge. But in all these years, nobody, to my knowledge, has said, "Hey, look at this instrument I found in my back yard after I saw a UFO back there."

All that these people (who reportedly are in communication via ESP) bring back is a great list of wisdom: Great Wisdom Number One: Don't engage in nuclear war. It will be bad for your planet. Wisdom Number Two: Worry about the ecology. *These* are ideas that we human beings would never have.... But supposing one of them came back and said, "Hey, ET said he understood that we have a problem with AIDS. They had AIDS 10,000 years ago, and they found that by mixing two parts of aspirin with one part of pulverized horse manure, it cures AIDS. There are plenty of people suffering with it who would try it. Supposing it cured AIDS and we tried it on others. I'd be convinced. But in nearly half a century, no such credible scientific evidence. Oh yeah, dead trees, excavations, crop circles—nothing that is unique to an extraterrestrial civilization.

GN: But you mentioned black magic: it would seem like magic...

PK: No, in that connection I have seen Doug Henning, a magician, cut two women in half on stage, swap the bottom halves, and they got up and walked off. Now, I *suspected* that Doug Henning was an extraterrestrial because of the

See *Klass*, page 9

Klass, from page 8

black magic, but I also suspect the hand is quicker than the eye.

I will predict that when you are on your deathbed, you will not know one iota more about what UFOs are. UFOs will still be a mystery, and if you have children, when *they* are on *their* deathbeds. Because this is the characteristic of pseudoscience. We don't know anything more about ghosts or leprechauns today than was known 50 or 100 years ago. This is the characteristic, the fingerprint, of pseudoscience—that the passage of time does not provide any increased knowledge or understanding.

GN: What would you say to this statement by Dr. Bernhard Haisch, an astrophysicist and editor of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* of the Society of Scientific Exploration: "History is full of impossibilities that came to pass, and who can say which of today's anomalies might be tomorrow's technology"?

PK: I would say that that is basically a true statement, but an incomplete one. Does this mean that every wild idea might be promising? For example, I have an idea that we could convert human urine into gasoline. If I had this idea, I would then write a paper that would be subjected to peer review, and I or someone would propose that we test that hypothesis *before* I said to the cities of the world, "Scrap your present water sewage plants and invest billions of dollars to extract the urine because you could use it for gasoline."

If you go back and read the book by Albert Einstein on his theory of relativity published for the layman, the general public, I think in 1913, it was a radical idea. Here was this young Swiss patent clerk saying that Sir Isaac Newton wasn't right. And in proposing his radical theory, Einstein proposed a number of ways in which it could be tested and proven to be true or false.

Thus it is with any new concepts, new ideas, such as mine for converting urine into gasoline. You write a paper, you present your theory, you suggest, or hopefully, run tests, to demonstrate, and then others try to replicate that. That is the way science works. So fundamentally, I would not quarrel with the statement except that it is too limited, and it does not mean that anything and everything is possible.

GN: Speaking of science, do you think it's ever possible for us to discover the "Final Theory"?

PK: That implies we will stop learning, and my present feeling is no. I can never imagine a time. There are more unanswered questions

today in physics, astronomy, astrophysics than there were 50 years ago. We know much more than we knew then, but the more you learn, the more questions there are. So I don't expect the time will ever come when we'll say, "No more physics students. We know everything."

GN: You've mentioned Stanton Friedman three or four times, and you just waved to him. How is your relationship with Stan?

PK: Reasonably friendly, which raises an interesting point—my relations with profologists. I have more friends among the pro-UFO community than I've ever had. A lot of the leaks, the scoops I get come from people on the other side of the fence who don't accept Roswell or Ed Walters, and so on. I don't try to convert them, they don't try to convert me.

GN: You've written four books on UFOs. Is there a fifth?

PK: I started one on the Roswell crashed saucer incident and was supposed to deliver the manuscript three years ago. I got a third of the way through, and then new developments began happening, plus the fact that I became so terribly busy.

GN: Do you feel you owe it to the skeptical community to finish the book?

PK: I do, and I'm looking for pills that will enable me to work 24 hours a day without sleeping. You know, at my age, you never know when the Grim Reaper will call. I would like to and hope to publish it, but it will be at least a year, maybe three years off.

GN: Originally, your background was technical, not journalism...

PK: Right, and this was one of the reasons I found UFOs fascinating in the early days. To a nontechnical person—or *many* nontechnical people—if a blip shows up on the radar scope, that must mean there's a solid object. Well, I know enough about radar, have written enough about radar, to know that's not true. To physicists, physical scientists not accustomed to dealing with fabricators, prevaricators... in the world of physical science, you rarely find fraud or falsehood. But my experience as a journalist taught me not to believe everything everyone tells me, but to check things out. I think my combination of backgrounds enabled me to do some interesting work in the early days. But today, the

See Klass, page 10

Worth Repeating

UFO Sighted in Argentina

"A flight crew for Aerolineas Argentinas and aviation officials on the ground observed a luminous object that approached the aircraft as it was about to land at Bariloche Airport, about 870 miles from Buenos Aires. Flight Captain Jorge Polanco told reporters that all of the lights in and around the airport went out just as the object departed and he was about to land. Control tower personnel reported that all of their instruments started behaving strangely at about the same time. Ground observers said the UFO appeared to have shining lights on its belly."

—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 8/12/95, internet posting from Wyatt Tellis

Another Air Force Cover-up?

"A longtime senior Air Force safety officer contends the military hushed up facts and played down investigations in dozens of plane crashes, some involving deeply embarrassing incidents of misconduct, to protect senior officers' careers... The official who made the accusations, Alan Diehl, was the Air Force's chief civilian safety official from 1987 until last October, when he was transferred against his will to a lesser advisory post at Kirtland Air Force Base in New Mexico... 'They were tired of [my] complaining about inadequate investigations of accidents,' said Diehl, who holds an engineering doctorate in systems safety... Diehl said he documented 30 accidents that killed 184 people—pilots, crews, and civilians—and destroyed billions of dollars worth of aircraft... [Diehl's] initial report led to the convening today of an independent panel of Air Force experts, ordered by Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Ronald Fogelman." —*New York Times/Houston Chronicle*, 6/24/95 ♦

MUFON-Houston Update



The
Marfa
Lights

The University of Texas
McDonald Observatory

Friday, September 22
Saturday, September 23
Sunday, September 24

MUFON-Houston Charter Bus Trip

See enclosed flyer
or call for details!

When I Heard the Learn'd Astronomer

by Walt Whitman

When I heard the learn'd
astronomer;
When the proofs, the figures,
were ranged in columns
before me;
When I was shown the charts
and the diagrams,
to add, divide, and
measure them;
When I, sitting, heard the
astronomer where he lectured
with much applause
in the lecture-room,
How soon, unaccountable,
I became tired and sick;
Till rising and gliding out,
I wander'd off by myself
in the mystical moist night-air,
And from time to time
Look'd up in perfect silence
at the stars.

Wanted: 34 adventurous types for fun weekend to view West Texas Marfa Lights.
Trip now forming for fast-paced, three-day jaunt on September 22, 23, & 24.
Absolute deadline for deposit (see flyer for details) Wednesday, September 13.

MUFON-Houston met Saturday afternoon, June 17, from 3 to 5PM, in the Harvey Hotel near Greenway Plaza. Despite the small Father's Day turnout (only 40 people), the meeting went well. We watched a Marfa Lights video and talked about the Marfa Lights trip (Texas readers, see insert). I introduced people who have helped out this year, including Vito Saccheri, who wrote last issue's feature on the NASA moon photos. After Vito took a few questions from the audience, we watched the Walt Disney UFO film, which most agreed seemed a quick, cheap marketing ploy to sell Extra-*terror*restrial, the new Disney ride. After a brief survey, 20 of us adjourned to a

long patio table at nearby Pico's, where UFOs—and other matters—were discussed until 9 PM.

During the meeting, I had handed out a short survey, which we answered quickly with a show of hands. The unscientific results revealed that the group attending was *very* interested in UFOs and that our opinions and beliefs were *very* diverse. Of the 40 there, 33 turned in completed surveys (totals varied per question). Here are a few of the results.

In answer to "What do you believe about UFOs?" quite a few marked more than one option: Two were holdouts for the nuts-and-bolts, "only extraterrestrial" explanation.

See MUFON, page 11

Klass, from page 9

field... If I were not already in the UFO field and were to hear papers like some I heard today or read in the proceedings....

GN: What about CSICOP, the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal?

PK: I'm on the executive council. CSICOP serves as a clearinghouse. Supposing you're the producer of a radio or TV talk show, and you're going to have Whitley Strieber on, and supposing you say, "Gee, I ought to have a skeptic on." But you don't know a skeptic, so you call CSICOP, and they would say, "Phil Klass." And you would say, "Oh, we can't afford to fly him in. Do you have anybody closer by? And they might say, "Jim Oberg lives in Houston. Why don't you invite him?"

I typically do two to three interviews a week, sometimes for talk shows, sometimes for print media. As a matter of fact, I did an interview with a Seattle paper [about the conference]. And I am generally favorable about MUFON. I made the point that some outsiders think people are only in the UFO field to make the fast buck. I pointed out that 99 percent of the MUFON members who work as investigators fund their investigations out of their pockets. They don't get rich—they're dedicated people. I said a few people who are organizing these conferences around the country—not this one—but the Expo West, and so on—they're in it for the

money, but that is the minority. So I speak highly of MUFON as an organization and of its members.

GN: As a skeptic, or debunker, if you saw an unmistakably clear silver disk hovering in the sky, would you admit it to anyone, or would you keep it to yourself?

PK: I'm glad you asked, but let's put it a little more thoughtfully. Supposing an honest-to-goodness extraterrestrial craft landed on my back patio. I would have two choices: I could say, "Gee, I've got some gasoline or a hand grenade. I could destroy it and not reveal that I'm wrong. But I'd say, if one landed here—even if I could destroy it—tomorrow, one might land on the front porch of the *Washington Post*, and they would be the ones to get the first authentic photos and break the story. So my instincts as a journalist would take over, and I'd say, "I'd rather be the first guy to get the photos, and so on." As I told you earlier, if and when I find a UFO incident that cannot rationally be explained in prosaic terms, I want to be the first to write it up. I'll expect to win a Pulitzer Prize—I don't know how many thousands of dollars that is—and get a giant bonus. And I'll be able to pay off Stanton Friedman without even feeling it. ♦

MUFON, from page 10

Another two accepted only the interdimensional origin. Twenty one said the phenomenon is both extraterrestrial and interdimensional. Another 11 said UFOs are an unknown form or combination of forms. Three marked "have no idea" as well as other options.

No surprise, 100% of those present believed that UFOs definitely exist—whatever the phenomenon is. Two people *also* marked "that the phenomenon is probably real."

When asked about the relative worth of the phenomenon, no one answered "evil and dangerous." On the other hand, 13 said it was a "combination of evil and good." Six said they thought it was "mysterious but probably for our good," while 12 admitted they "didn't know enough yet to say."

For the question "Do you believe the stories of the following people?" Ed Walters had the highest following, with 52% believing, 10% not, and 38% not knowing (an ambiguous question and response). Whitley Strieber was second, with 44% believing, 12% not, and 44% unsure. Linda Cortille came next, with 41% believing her story (and Budd Hopkins'), only one person not, and 56% not knowing (we're still waiting for that book.). Bob Lazar beat Billy Meier by one vote, with 22% believing, 34% not, and 44% not sure. Finally, the still popular Billy Meier had a surprising (to me) 20% following, but with 43% not believing and 37% not knowing (stay tuned for a new book exposing Meier, due out very soon).

Personal sightings? Nine said yes, with five having had multiple sightings and four, one for

sure. Eight more had possibly had one or more sightings, while 15 (47%) had never seen a thing.

Personal experiences? An amazing half of those who answered the survey reported that they were either experiencers (six people) or possible experiencers (10).

As mentioned on the mailed-out membership survey, for MUFON-Houston to expand its activities, eventually, members will need to pay either local membership dues, admission fees for programs, or both. The more money, the more activities. MUFON (Seguin) does not return any of your membership fee to the local group. I was glad to find that 19 people (63%) said they would pay "dues and fees." From an organizational standpoint, that is the easiest way to cover expenses. Five people preferred "dues only (to cover various costs to volunteers)," and another five preferred "admission fees only." Only one "wouldn't pay."

What about paying for *Houston Sky*, beginning with the October/November issue? Gratifyingly, 81% said yes, and except for one no, the rest said maybe.

What can you suggest to make *Houston Sky* better? Two suggested photos and color (sorry, but in your dreams!). Four suggested these topics: more local interest (look for a Southwest Texas MUFON case update next issue), book reports (several have already appeared), crop circles (probably only if they occur in the area), and short reviews of UFO conferences, radio programs, etc. There were several very nice compliments—thanks! —Gayle Nesom ♦

MUFON-Houston Reminders and Updates

Houston Sky will be available by *subscription only* beginning with the next issue (see insert or form on page 2).

We are planning a three-day, whirlwind bus trip to view the Marfa Lights, with a star party to be held at the nearby University of Texas McDonald Observatory—September 22, 23, and 24 (see insert; call if you didn't get an insert but want one).

A second investigator's training class will probably be offered in the fall, details to come (call if you are really interested).

A group of 10 local-member volunteers met in July to make plans and goals for MUFON-Houston's second year. We will meet again after the Marfa trip. New volunteers are welcome.

We are continuing to develop the group's investigation network and resources. More about that in the next newsletter.

Hope to see you on the Marfa trip!

UFO LINGO

phenomenon (*singular*) The "classic" UFO phenomenon is ever changing.
phenomena (*plural*) The many and varied phenomena are perplexing.

"...here and there a touch of good grammar for picturesqueness." —Mark Twain

HOUSTON SKY

No. 6, Aug./Sept. 1995

Houston Sky is published as a forum for the open exchange of ideas and information for Houston-area MUFON members and others. Because views within the UFO community are so varied, the opinions and observations expressed in *HS* do not necessarily reflect the views of the editorial staff or of other MUFON members.

Reprint Policy: Selections may be reprinted. Please credit *Houston Sky* and identify it as a Houston-area MUFON publication.

Circulation: *HS* is published six times a year (and began in October 1994). Houston and Southeast Texas MUFON members will receive a first issue free. *HS* welcomes swaps with other publications. Subscriptions are \$15 a year, \$20 foreign. For individual copies, send an SASE and a check for \$3.

HS's Sept./Oct. 1995 issue is being mailed to 350 readers. Arcturus Books Inc. includes *HS* in its monthly catalogue.

The Mutual UFO Network is a nonprofit Texas Corporation with an international membership of 5,000. Annual membership is \$25.

103 Oldtowne Rd.

Seguin, Texas 78155-4099

MUFON UFO Hotline:
(800) UFO-2166

HS Editor: Gayle Nesom
Assistant State Director,
Harris Co./Southeast Texas
(713) 772-0222 (phone/fax)

Contributor: Rebecca Schatte
Houstonsky@aol.com
Reviewer: David Mayo
Columnist: Bill Eatwell

Houston Sky
PO Box 1718
Bellaire, Texas 77402

© 1995, *Houston Sky*



The GAO Report:

International Roswell Initiative Bulletin # 3

by Kent Jeffrey, Coordinator

The Government Accounting Office (GAO) report on the 1947 Roswell incident was released on July 28, 1995. The report consists of an eight-page letter to Congressman Steven Schiff of New Mexico and includes nine pages of appendices. In summary, the report states that an extensive search for records was conducted and nothing of consequence was found. Noteworthy is that the GAO report refers to the 1994 Air Force report only briefly and offers no evidence to support the Air Force report's Project Mogul balloon hypothesis. The GAO report also contains no significant revelations and no conclusion.

Unlike the 1994 Air Force report, which represents a selective and obviously biased presentation of the facts, the GAO report is objective and straightforward. Significantly, it is admitted in the report that "our search of government records was complicated by the fact that some records we wanted to review were missing and there was not always an explanation." Most significant is that the outgoing messages from Roswell Army Air Field (RAAF) for the period from October 1946 through December 1949 were destroyed without authorization. Those messages would most probably have contained the key to what really occurred at Roswell in 1947.

It could be strictly coincidental that those records are missing. However, in view of the conflicting stories told by the military at the time (the two July 8, 1947, press releases), the absence of the records is very "conve-

nient" and therefore suspicious. Also interesting is the fact that no documentation for the 1395th Military Police Company could be located. Presumably, this would have been the outfit responsible for guarding the debris.

During the course of the investigation, the GAO did query such agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the National Security Council (NSC) for records on Roswell. The GAO investigators, however, were not given direct access to the files of those agencies. Instead, the GAO received brief written responses, but was not able to independently verify the information contained in them.

The Roswell event, whatever its cause, was one of the biggest public relations fiascos in military history. Given the government's penchant for keeping records, the fact that not one single official military file or record can be found to document this event strains all credibility. While the GAO report provides no definitive answers, it does bring to light the absence of certain critical evidence, thereby raising new questions and underscoring the need for further and more thorough investigation into this unusual event. As coordinator of the International Roswell Initiative, I assure you that in the months ahead, we will be redoubling our efforts, both in the investigation of the Roswell case itself and in the effort to make it resoundingly clear to our political leaders that the vast majority of people desire a more open and candid U.S. government policy concerning the entire UFO phenomenon.♦

See you at the movies!

Merlin Productions Presents "Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction?"

7 PM, Monday, August 28, Fox Network, Channel 26 (Houston)

Of Interest

Houston Area

MUFON-Houston

Marfa Lights and UT McDonald Observatory Charter Bus Trip
Weekend of Sept. 22, 23, and 24—
See enclosed flyer for details or call Gayle Nesom at 772-0222.

VISIT (Vehicle Internal Systems Investigative Team)

Freeman Memorial Library
16602 Diana Lane, Clear Lake City

HUFON (Houston UFO Network)

First Friday of the Month, 7:00 PM
Innova Building, 20 Greenway Plaza

Elsewhere

4th Annual Midwest Conference on UFO Research

Sept. 9-10, Springfield, Missouri
(417) 882-6847

Lindemann, Fawcett, Walton, Luca

The UFO Experience

Oct. 7-8, North Haven, Connecticut
PO Box 2051, Cheshire, CT 06410
Vallee, Hoagland, Friedman, Webb

3rd Annual Gulf Breeze UFO Conf.

Oct. 20-22, Gulf Breeze, Florida
(904) 432-8888

Streiber, Sitchin, Wolf, Maccabee

The Science and Politics of UFO Research

Oct. 28-29, St. Paul, Minnesota
(612) 780-5916

Jacobs, Haines, Maccabee, Swords

**MUFON UFO Hotline
(800) UFO-2166**

"A lie can run around the world before the truth can get its boots on." —James Watt

HOUSTON SKY
PO Box 1718
Bellaire, TX 77402



Forwarding & Address
Correction Requested